



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

Baltimore, December, 1897.

THE FORTY-FOURTH CONVENTION OF GERMAN PHILOLOGISTS AND EDUCATORS,

Dresden, Sept. 29 to Oct. 2, 1897.

ALTHOUGH the expectations of the managing committee, who had provided twelve hundred copies of the programme for the first day of the convention, were not realized, the concourse of scholars was nevertheless, compared with the attendance at the meetings of our learned associations in America, a vast one, the registration showing a total of seven hundred and twenty-nine members present. What the assembly lacked in size, according to the standard established by previous conventions, notably the last one at Cologne in 1895, it certainly made up in distinction; there were professors from nearly all the universities of Germany, Austria and Switzerland—*so weit die deutsche Zunge klingt*—among them many of the leading scholars in philology, ancient and modern; there were also hosts of Directoren, Professoren, Oberlehrer, etc., from Gymnasias, Realymnasias, Technische Hochschulen, and institutions of a similar grade, with a sprinkling of librarians, students and laymen interested in philology. Some there were too who hailed from foreign parts: Italy, Holland, Iceland, Bosnia, Roumania, and the United States (2). As early as the evening of Sept. 28 the members began to assemble in the magnificent hall of the Society for Home Missions, whose spacious *Vereinshaus* served as the headquarters of the convention; Prof. Ribbeck (Leipzig) informally addressed the meeting and welcomed the guests. The first official session was held on the following morning, and was attended by King Albert and Prince George of Saxony, who met with an enthusiastic reception. After the session had been opened by the chairman, Oberschulrat Wohlrab (Dresden), Prof. Tocilescu (Bukarest) brought greetings from the Roumanian Academy of Sciences; then followed addresses by the minister of education von Seydewitz, and by the mayor of Dresden; and finally Prof. Treu (Dresden) read a paper

on "Winckelmann and Modern Sculpture," in which he argued against the imitation of the ancients and in favor of a plastic art, breathing the spirit of our times, and combining with beauty of form the embodiment of inspiring thoughts and elevating emotions.

After the general session the assembly organized itself, as usual, in a number of sections for the discussion of subjects coming, respectively, under the following heads: 1. Classical Philology, 2. Pedagogy, 3. Archaeology, 4. Epigraphy, 5. History, 6. Mathematics and Natural Sciences, 7. Germanic Philology, 8. Modern Romance and English Philology, 9. Oriental Philology, 10. Indogermanic (Comparative) Philology, 11. *Bibliothekswissenschaft* (Bibliography, Management of Libraries, etc.). The various sections thereupon adjourned to the halls placed at their disposal by the gymnasias and other public institutions of Dresden, and soon after, separately, went into session.

In the section for Germanic Philology where Prof. Sievers presided, Prof. Siebs (Greifswald) introduced a resolution calling attention to the fact that the *Bühnenaussprache*, though usually considered the normal German pronunciation, is not in all respects satisfactory from a scientific point of view, and is not even uniform in all parts of Germany; and recommending that the *Bühnenverein* be invited to coöperate with the philologists in an effort to establish a normal pronunciation and to introduce it on the stage and in the schools throughout the country. The resolution was unanimously adopted, and Professor Siebs reported that Professors Seemüller (München) and Vietor (Marburg) had already agreed to act with him as a provisional committee (representing Lower, Middle, and Upper Germany) in furtherance of his project.—The progress of this movement will be eagerly watched; but in the meantime we may be pardoned for being sceptical as to the feasibility of the scheme, so far at least as Middle and especially Upper Germany are concerned.—Prof. Siebs was followed by Privatdocent Dr. Meier (Halle) with a paper on "Kunstlied und Volkslied." The speaker denied that there was any difference

in the manner in which these two kinds of songs originated and endeavored to show that the sole determining factor in the classification of songs under one or the other of these two heads was the attitude of the lower classes towards them; all songs which *das Volk* loves to sing, which it does not recognize as anyone's individual property that it feels at liberty to modify in text or tune, all such songs are folksongs.

In the section for modern philology, where Prof. Wülker presided, Prof. Luick (Graz) discussed the "Changes of Quantity in the English Language," ascribing them to the popular liking for sentence-rhythm, that is, to the tendency to make the different beats of approximately equal length, and hence to change the length of syllables according to the number of syllables in a beat. During the discussion which followed, Prof. Suchier (Halle) called attention to evidence of the operation of similar influences in the Romance Languages.

The programme of the Germanic section for the second day was both rich and interesting. Prof. Streitberg (Freiburg, Switzerland) demonstrated convincingly, that the so-called *Opus Imperfectum*, an ill-preserved commentary on the Gospel of Matthew, could not have been written, as Professor Kauffman has asserted, by a Goth, much less by *Ulfila* himself, but that the author must have been a Roman (living probably in Spain or Southern Gaul), and the commentary originated thirty or forty years after the death of *Ulfila*.—Privatdozent Dr. Krauss (Vienna) read an admirable paper on "The Language of Heinrich von Veldeke." From linguistic material obtained by an exhaustive investigation of the rhymes of that poet he argued clearly and forcibly, and with much acumen, that the *Eneit* as we have it could not be a High German revision of an original in the Maestricht dialect, but that it must have been written from the first in essentially the language in which it has come down to us, the poet deliberately choosing rhymes, words, and inflections that conformed to High German usage and carefully avoiding those of a purely dialectic nature; a practice quite common among the Middle High German poets and, as we know, universally followed by those of the seventeenth century. It was of

course impossible to form a final opinion of the weight of Dr. Krauss' conclusions without a thorough examination, in detail, of the material upon which they were based, and which he was not able to submit within the time at his disposal; but there was among the audience apparently but one voice as to the general merit of the method employed and the judgment displayed by him.—Third on the programme came Privatdozent Dr. Zwierżina (Graz), who recommended the compilation of special rhyme-dictionaries for the works of Hartmann, Wolfram and Gottfried as an indispensable aid to the study of the development of style and poetical technique.—The last speaker of the session was Privatdozent Dr. Bremer (Halle) who outlined the problems of dialect-study, and urged a close organization and coöperation of Germanic philologists all over the country for the purpose of an exhaustive collection of dialect material, and exact delineation of dialect boundaries. In the discussion which followed, Prof. Sievers pointed out the difficulties in the way of such an organization. Dr. Schullerus (Hermannstadt) then reported briefly on the progress of the Transsylvania-German Dictionary.

In the section for Modern Philology, in the meantime, only two papers were read, about which I obtained the following particulars. Prof. Schneegans (Strassburg) attributed diphthongization in the Romance languages generally to psychological causes; namely, to the emotions (joy, pain, fear, anger, etc.), which induce a raising of the voice, and by added stress first lengthening, then breaking, and finally diphthongising of the vowels. This theory was opposed by Professors Morf (Zürich), Suchier (Halle) and Voretzsch (Tübingen).—Prof. Vetter (Zürich) discussed the "Life and the Works of Robert Greene," and declared the autobiographical work *Repentance*, on account of its numerous inconsistencies, a forgery; a similar opinion he expressed of the pamphlet entitled *A Groatworth of Wit bought with a Million of Repentance* which, he thinks, may have been written by Henry Chettle, in spite of this gentleman's disavowal. At the general meeting of that morning one of the three papers read was of special interest to modern philologists: that of Prof. Del-

brück (Jena) on "Comparative Syntax." In a lucid and often delightfully humorous manner, the speaker traced the changes which have taken place since Franz Bopp and Ernst Curtius in the accepted views concerning the origin of inflections and the fundamental conceptions of syntactical relation, and defined his own now essentially sceptical position as compared with that held by him in former years (notably in his *Syntaktische Forschungen*). Theories, he said, have become more or less discredited; we now ask "What are the ascertainable facts concerning the *Grundsprache*?"—and we accordingly confine ourselves to the investigation of the various *Gebrauchstypen*. Of the composition of these typical forms, or of their earliest significance, the speakers of the *Grundsprache* were not conscious any more than we are now; the question as to the earliest conception inherent in a certain type (as for instance the genitive form) can be answered only by psychology, and then only conjecturally; and to ascertain the relative age of the various types we must collect extensive statistical material from as many Indogermanic Languages as possible.

On the third day of the convention I attended first the session of the section for Pedagogy, where Dr. Otto Lyon read a most interesting paper on the "Aims of the Teaching of German in our Time." He demanded, first, that the pupil be taught to regard his language as a living organism which is constantly changing, not as a set of rigid forms and inflections where, as in the "dead languages" there is only one correct usage, to the exclusion of all others; that the teacher accordingly, while insisting upon the accepted rules of grammar, inculcate tolerance towards variations in usage, towards colloquialisms and dialectic speech. In the second place the teaching of literature should be psychologically deepened: the one-sided intellectual training afforded by the customary analyses of the works read should be restricted; the instruction should tend to cultivate the emotions, the will-power and the imagination by laying greater stress than heretofore upon the personality and the inner life of the poet, and upon the characters and the motives of the persons appearing in his works. At the conclusion of Dr. Lyon's lecture, I

went to the meeting-place of the section for Modern Philology, where in the meantime Prof. Scheffer of the Polytechnic Institute of Dresden had read a paper on "The Stage of Molière and the French Theatre at the Court of the Elector of Saxony," describing the evolution of the theatre from the primitive rectangular form to the horse-shoe style first introduced in the *Dresdner Komödienhaus*, and elucidating his remarks by means of contemporary plans and pictures, and beautifully executed models of Molière's theatre in the Palais Royal and of a stage erected by Louis XIV in the park of Versailles.—Dr. Vollhardt of the Realschule of Leipzig-Reudnitz followed with a paper on "Shakespeare's Models for Oberon and Titania." According to him, the Titania is derived from Ovid (Metam.) where it stands for Artemis-Diana; Oberon is undoubtedly none other than Alberic (Gaston Paris), but the Oberon of the Old-French romances is not the same as Shakespeare's Oberon; the idea of the peculiar relations between Oberon and Titania, and between them and the unhappy lovers, came not as Ten Brink supposed, from Jorge da Montemajor, but from the pastoral romance *Gli Intricati* of the Italian Posqualizo.—Dr. Schumann of Dresden next reported on the recent discovery of a valuable set of drawings dating back to the fifteenth century and representing the principal scenes in the *Roman de Troie*. They are of French origin and were evidently intended as designs for tapestry. Prof. Varnhagen (Erlangen) then gave a very welcome description of the *Staatsexamen* in Modern Philology as it is conducted in Bavaria; his remarks were supplemented by Professors Vollmöller (Dresden) and Schipper (Vienna), with observations on peculiarities of the corresponding examinations in Prussia and Austria. The section then proceeded to the election of officers for the next convention, with the result that Prof. Wülker was unanimously re-elected chairman; finally Professor Schipper tendered to those present a cordial invitation to attend the Neuphilologentag at Vienna next year (the following Whitsunday), whereupon the section adjourned.

The programme of the third session of the section for Germanic Philology was as follows:

Dr. Reuschel (Dresden): "The Earliest Luther Plays;" Prof. Hauffen (Prague); "Johann Fischart's Library;" Privatdozent Dr. Drescher (Bonn); "The Author of the Pseudo-Stainhöwelian Translation of the Decamerone" (the author was Pastor Heinrich Leuwin of St. Sebaldus, Nürnberg); Privatdozent Dr. Uhl (Königsberg); "The Name and the Nature of the German *Priamel*." (The designation *Priamel* was primarily a *Studentenwitz*, being intended to ridicule the *quaestio praeambularis* in vogue at Erfurt and presumably also at other German universities, precisely as the term *Quodlibet* was derived from *quaestio quodlibetica*.) For the next convention Prof. Bulthaupt (Bremen) was elected chairman of the Germanic section. At the general session that morning Prof. Burdach (Halle) read a masterly treatise on the "Origin of the Mediæval Romances," or rather, to describe the subject better, on the evolution of the romance from the earliest Alexander-stories to the court epic of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries; a comprehensive subject indeed, but treated by the speaker with a command of the vast material involved and with a thoughtfulness and originality which won from the dignified assembly the unusual tribute of enthusiastic applause. It would, of course, be vain to attempt to give a brief summary of so comprehensive a paper.

The last session on Saturday morning was devoted mainly to business. The chairmen of the various sections made their reports, the time (1899) and place (Bremen) of the next meeting were determined, whereupon the convention adjourned.

It is worthy of mention that no less than eleven Festschriften were published in honor of the convention, for free distribution among the members. As to the social side of the meeting, the provisions made for the entertainment of the guests were simply perfect. The well-managed banquet on Wednesday, with actually not a single dull speech; the courtesy of the directors of the various museums who not only granted to the members of the Convention free admission, but conducted them personally through their collections; the special performance of Bungert's splendid new opera *Odysseus' Heimkehr* at

the Royal Opera House; the reception given by the city of Dresden in the main hall of the International Art Exposition, with a concert by the famous choir of the Kreuzschule, followed by a supper and a *Kommers*; and the excursions by special steamers to the Bastei and to Meissen; all these features contributed to make the convention as enjoyable as it was instructive, and memorable withal.

HUGO K. SCHILLING.

[Harvard University].

AMERICAN-FRENCH DIALECT COMPARISON.

Two Acadian-French Dialects compared with "Some Specimens of a Canadian-French Dialect Spoken in Maine."

PAPER NO. II.¹ A.

"Some Specimens of a Canadian-French Dialect Spoken in Maine" is the title of a paper by Professor E. S. Sheldon, of Harvard University, published in the *Transactions and Proceedings of the Mod. Lang. Association of America*,² in which the writer by recording phonetically one hundred and thirty-seven locutions (words, phrases, expressions), gives an idea of what may be heard in local dialect French in Maine. I have already shown in Paper No. I, by a word for word comparison, such differences as the three dialects there compared may offer, attempting when possible to explain or account for features especially interesting when compared with standard French. It is now the purpose of this paper to make a similar comparison of the two Acadian dialects recorded in Paper No. I with the Specimens from the Canadian-French dialect of Maine examined by Professor Sheldon.

The sound notation used in Paper No. I, as there stated, is identical or meant to be as nearly so as possible with Professor Sheldon's, which is also adhered to here and given for convenience of reference. In no other way, I believe, can the "regular character of sound changes in popular dialects" be so faithfully and strikingly presented as by the use of pho-

¹ Paper No. I appeared in MOD. LANG. NOTES for December, 1893, and in the January and February numbers for 1894. Also issued separately.

² *Ib.* Vol. iii (1887), pp. 210-218. Also issued separately.